

Zola, however, replied very naturally, frankly, and boldly, that he, Flaubert, possessed a small fortune and was therefore able to disregard all sorts of considerations, whereas he, Zola, had been obliged to earn his living by his pen and undertake at times all kinds of writing, even contemptible work. "What I write," he added, "may be divided into two parts. There are my books by which I am judged, and by which I desire to be judged; and there are my critical notices in 'Le Bien Public,' my Eussian articles, and my correspondence for Marseilles which I regard as of no account, which I reject, and which I only undertake in order to help on my books. I first placed a nail in position and with the stroke of a hammer I drove it half an inch into the brain of the public, then with a second blow I drove it in an inch. "Well, my hammer is the newspaper work which I myself do round my own books."¹

Nothing could have been more frank than this, not even his remark on the same occasion — in reply evidently to some criticism of Flaubert's, which G-oncourt does not exactly specify, — that he cared not a rap for the word "naturalism," and yet intended to repeat it, because things required christening in order that the public might regard them as new.² In all this one traces the

determination to
succeed at any cost, the fighting spirit which
had prompted
Zola to write to Antony Valabregue, more than
ten years
previously, that he belonged to an impatient
age, that if he
did not trample others under foot they would
pass over him,
and that he did not desire to be crushed by
fools. Thus,
whatever might be his contempt for the
weapons of his time

¹ "Journal des Goncourt," Vol. T, pp. 314-315.

² It is probable that Flaubert had questioned the novelty
of "Naturalism."